

REMARKS

1. Amendments to the claims

Claims 1-6 and 10-13 are pending in the present application. The Applicants have amended claims 1-6 and 10-13, and added new claims 14-17. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found in Figures 2-5 and related portions of the specification. In particular, support for the wording *"extracts a hard disk access command from at least one interface signal"* can be seen, for example, from the description of element 32 in Figure 3 and related portions of the specification. Support for the wording *"data package"* can be seen, for example, from the description of element 34 in Figure 3 and related portions of the specification, also in view of the further encapsulation operation of element 36 in Figure 3. Further, support for the wording *"encapsulates the data package into at least one network packet to be sent through a network"* can be seen, for example, from the description of element 36 in Figure 3 and related portions of the specification. Support for the feature *"after receiving the at least one network packet, the server reconstructs the data package from the at least one network packet, extracts the hard disk access command and the identity number"* can be found, for example, in Figure 5 and related portions of the specification. No new matter has been added.

2. Applicant's response after final dated October 31, 2005

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the arguments filed by Applicants in the response dated October 31, 2005

3. Claims 1 and 10

Claim 1 is currently being rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,421,711 to Blumenau in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,968 to Knox and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,659,801 to Kopsaftis. Claim 1 is currently being rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,477,624 to Kedem in view of Kopsaftis.

i) Claim 1 recites that the *"transforming device . . . extracts a hard disk access command from at least one interface signal sent from the diskless client."* The Applicants have not been able to find this feature in Knox.

ii) Claim 1 also recites that the *"transforming device . . . packs the hard disk access command and an identity number relative to the diskless client into a data package."*

The Applicants have already noted and note again the Examiner's allegation that Knox implicitly teaches receiving an access command and packing it with an identifier into a packet. The Applicants make reference to the response filed by Applicants on October 31, 2005, where the Applicants have reminded the Examiner that the standard for implicit disclosure relates to something which is present in a disclosure instead of something that could be present. Even assuming, arguendo, that Knox teaches sending both a hard disk access command and an identifier, where it is stated that the command and the identifier are packed in the same package or packet? The Applicants note that such arguments have not been addressed by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of November 17, 2005. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully invited to review previous response and give due consideration to the arguments presented therein.

In addition to the above arguments, the Applicants note that, contrary to the language of claim 1, Knox discloses a client IP address. An address is not an *"identity number."* Further, an address is not a *"data package"* because it is part of a header of a network packet.

iii) Further, claim 1 as amended recites that *"the at least one interface signal complies with a peripheral interface standard allowing for connecting of a peripheral device to a PC."*

Also in this case, the Applicants make reference to the October 31, 2005 response, where Applicants have explained in detail why they disagree with the

Examiner's determination that such feature is disclosed in Kopsaftis. Those arguments have not been addressed by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of November 17, 2005. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully invited to review previous response and give due consideration to the arguments presented therein.

iv) Moreover, claim 1 recites that *"after receiving the at least one network packet, the server reconstructs the data package from the at least one network packet, extracts the hard disk access command and the indentivity number."* The Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art also in view of such feature.

Similar considerations apply to amended claim 10. In particular, the Applicants submit that claim 10 as amended is patentable over a combination of Kedem and Kopsaftis.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 2-6, and 11-17

Claims 2-6, 14 and 15 depend on claim 1. Moreover, claims 11, 13, 16 and 17 depend on claim 10. Therefore, all those claims are deemed to be patentable at least in view of such dependencies. Moreover, Applicants submit that those claims also contain on their own features that make them patentable over the cited art.

* * * * *

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat

this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, POB 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

February 1, 2006

(Date of Transmission)

Susan Papp

(Name of Person Transmitting)

Susan Papp

(Signature)

02/01/06

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinfl

Alessandro Steinfl
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 56, 448
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard,
Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile
asteinfl@ladas.com

Encl.: Request for Continued Examination

RCE Fee for \$395

Petition for Extension of Time for 3 months

Fee for \$510.00

Postcard